

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 16, 1999 (64 FR 32290).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 2000.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Southern California Edison Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3, San Diego County, California

Date of application for amendments: December 2, 1999, as supplemented May 16 and June 16, 2000 (PCN-506).

Brief description of amendments: These amendments approve changes to Technical Specifications, Section 5.0, "Administrative Controls," and the Environmental Protection Plan.

Date of issuance: July 7, 2000.

Effective date: July 7, 2000, to be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 2-168; Unit 3-159.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 29, 1999 (64 FR 73096). The May 16 and June 16, 2000, letters provided additional information and clarifications that were within the scope of the original **Federal Register** notice and did not change the staff's initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 2000.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: October 18, 1999, as supplemented May 11, 2000.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to require a revised activated charcoal testing methodology in accordance with the guidance provided by Generic Letter 99-02, "Laboratory Testing of Nuclear Grade Activated Charcoal."

Date of Issuance: July 11, 2000.

Effective date: As of its date of issuance, and shall be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 189.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-28: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 17, 1999 (64 FR 62716).

The May 11, 2000, supplement did not expand the scope of the application as initially noticed, or change the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 11, 2000.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of July 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John A. Zwolinski,

Director, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 00-18771 Filed 7-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NUREG-1620]

Review of A Reclamation Plan For Mill Tailings Sites Under Title II of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act; Final Standard Review Plan

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has published the Final Standard Review Plan for Review of a Reclamation Plan for Mill Tailings Sites Under Title II of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act (NUREG-1620). An NRC source and byproduct material license is required under the provisions of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 40 (10 CFR part 40), Domestic Licensing of Source Material, in conjunction with uranium or thorium milling, or with byproduct material at sites formerly associated with such milling. An applicant for a new reclamation plan, or for the renewal or amendment of an existing license, is required to provide detailed information on the facilities, and procedures to be used, and if appropriate, an environmental report that discusses the effect of proposed operations on public health and safety and on the environment. This information is used by Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff to determine whether the proposed activities will be protective of public health and safety and the environment. The standard review plan provides

guidance to NRC staff for the review of reclamation plans while ensuring consistency and uniformity among the staff reviews. Each section in the review plan provides detailed review guidance on subject matter required in a standard reclamation plan. The review plan is intended to improve the understanding of the staff review process by interested members of the public and the uranium recovery industry. The final version includes updates based on public comment on the draft Standard Review Plan for the Review of a Reclamation Plan for Mill Tailings Sites Under Title II of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act.

Availability: Copies of NUREG-1620 may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, PO Box 37082, Washington, DC 20402-9328. Copies are also available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161. Paper and electronic copies are available for inspection and/or copying in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC. An electronic copy can be accessed for reading, searching, or copying under "Technical Reports in the NUREG Series" of the "NRC Reference Library" at the NRC Web site, (<http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/NUREGS>).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of July, 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Philip Ting,

Chief, Fuel Cycle Licensing Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 00-18919 Filed 7-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Cumulative Report on Rescissions and Deferrals

July 1, 2000.

Section 1014(e) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) requires a monthly report listing all budget authority for the current fiscal year for which, as of the first day of the month, a special message had been transmitted to Congress.

This report gives the status, as of July 1, 2000, of three rescission proposals and two deferrals contained in one special message for FY 2000. The message was transmitted to Congress on February 9, 2000.

Rescissions (Attachments A and C)

As of July 1, 2000, three rescission proposals totaling \$128 million have been transmitted to the Congress. Attachment C shows the status of the FY 2000 rescission proposals.

Deferrals (Attachments B and D)

As of July 1, 2000, \$485 million in budget authority was being deferred from obligation. Attachment D shows the status of each deferral reported during FY 2000.

Information From Special Message

The special message containing information on the rescission proposals and deferrals that are covered by this cumulative report is printed in the edition of the **Federal Register** cited

below: 65 FR 9017, Wednesday, February 23, 2000.

Jacob J. Lew,
Director.

Attachment A

STATUS OF FY 2000 RESCISSIONS [In millions of dollars]	
	Budgetary resources
Rescissions proposed by the President	128.0
Rejected by the Congress	
Pending before the Congress for more than 45 days (available for obligation)	– 128.0
Currently before the Congress for less than 45 days	

Attachment B

STATUS OF FY 2000 DEFERRALS [In millions of dollars]	
	Budgetary resources
Deferrals proposed by the President	1,622.0
Routine Executive releases through July 1, 2000. (OMB/Agency releases of \$1,153.3 million, partially offset by a cumulative positive adjustment of \$16.1 million) ..	– 1,137.2
Overtaken by the Congress	
Currently before the Congress	484.8

ATTACHMENT C
Status of FY 2000 Rescission Proposals - As of July 1, 2000
 (Amounts in thousands of dollars)

Agency/Bureau/Account	Rescission Number	Amounts Pending Before Congress		Date of Message	Previously Withheld and Made Available	Date Made Available	Amount Rescinded	Congressional Action
		Less than 45 days	More than 45 days					
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY								
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					*			
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management..	R00-1		13,000	2-9-00				
Energy Programs					*			
SPR Petroleum Account.....	R00-2		12,000	2-9-00				
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT								
Public and Indian Housing					*			
Housing Certificate Fund.....	R00-3		103,000	2-9-00				
TOTAL, RESCISSIONS.....			128,000					

* No funds were withheld.

ATTACHMENT D
Status of FY 2000 Deferrals - As of July 1, 2000
 (Amounts in thousands of dollars)

Agency/Bureau/Account	Deferral Number	Amounts Transmitted		Date of Message	Releases(-)		Congressional Action	Cumulative Adjustments	Amount Deferred as of 7-1-00
		Original Request	Subsequent Change (+)		Cumulative OMB/Agency	Congressionally Required			
DEPARTMENT OF STATE									
Other									
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund.....	D00-1	172,858		2-9-00	27,548				145,310
INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS									
International Security Assistance Economic Support Fund.....	D00-2	1,449,159		2-9-00	1,125,790			16,133	339,502
TOTAL, DEFERRALS.....		1,622,017			1,153,338			16,133	484,812

[FR Doc. 00-18855 Filed 7-25-00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3110-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-43055; File No. SR-Phlx-98-43]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc.; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change and Notice of Filing and Order Granting Accelerated Approval to Amendment No. 4 to the Proposed Rule Change Amending Its Procedures Regarding Stop Order Bans and Requiring the Use of Account Identifiers for PACE Users

July 19, 2000.

1. Introduction

On November 18, 1998, the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc. ("Phlx" or "Exchange") submitted to the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission"), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act")¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² a proposed rule change to amend its procedures regarding stop order and stop limit order bans and require the use of account identifiers for PACE users. On December 9, 1998, February 2, 1999, and July 14, 1999, respectively, the Exchange filed Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to the proposal with the Commission.³

The proposed rule change, including Amendments 1, 2, and 3, was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on September 1, 1999.⁴ On July 17, 2000, the Exchange filed Amendment No. 4 to the proposal with the Commission.⁵ No

comments were received on the proposal. This notice and order approves the proposed rule change, as amended, and seeks comment from interested persons on Amendment No. 4.

II. Description of the Proposal

The Exchange has previously adopted circuit breaker rules, paralleling the rules of other exchanges.⁶ At this time, the Exchange proposes, like other exchanges, to prohibit the entry of stop and stop limit orders during times of market stress.⁷

Proposed Rule 134 will establish a procedure prohibiting the entry of stop orders and stop limit orders whenever the primary market for a stock admitted to dealings on the Exchange institutes a stop and stop limit order ban. When the primary market institutes a stop and stop limit order ban, the Exchange will also ban such orders in the stock (or stocks) until such time as the ban in the primary market is lifted.

The Exchange will use the following procedures to implement a stop order ban. Following notice from the Consolidated Tape, the Exchange will announce to the floor and to PACE users that a stop order ban is in effect in a particular issue (or issues). the entry of stop and stop limit orders on the Phlx would be prohibited until the ban in the primary market is lifted and that information is disseminated on the Consolidated Tape. Any stop or stop limit orders residing on the specialist's book when a ban goes into effect for a stock that is subject to the ban may⁸ be canceled by the Exchange with the approval of two Floor Officials and a market regulation officer.⁹

The Exchange believes that it is appropriate to ban stop orders and stop limit orders when the primary market institutes a ban because, in a volatile market, stop orders can accumulate at

various prices and, if triggered, the stop orders may increase price fluctuations. Because other exchanges have adopted stop order ban procedures, Phlx is concerned that a migration of stop and stop limit orders to the Phlx could occur, thus causing a burden on Phlx specialists.

The Exchange also proposes requiring PACE¹⁰ users to attach account identifiers on orders submitted through PACE. Among other things, this will allow the system to distinguish orders for the account of an individual investor from other orders. Specifically, Rule 229, Commentary .20 will require that all orders sent through PACE shall include the appropriate account designator. The following are acceptable account types: "P"—principal order;¹¹ "A"—agency; "I"—individual investor; "D"—program trade, non-index arbitrage for member/member organization; "J"—program trade, index arbitrage for individual customers; "K"—program trade, non-index arbitrage for individual customer; "U"—program trade, index arbitrage for other agency; and "Y"—program trade, non-index arbitrage for other agency. Orders for less than 2,099 shares with the account identifier of "I" would still be able to be entered during the duration of the ban. Other orders will be automatically rejected by the PACE System.

The Exchange believes that the proposed account identifiers will enhance efficiency and accuracy of audit trail information and will facilitate surveillance investigations by readily identifying a member's proprietary trades. More accurate audit trail information should also increase the effectiveness of the Exchange's surveillance procedures.¹² Member firms will be given notice following the approval of the proposal to enable them to comply with new order identification requirements.

The purpose of the proposed rule is to reduce selling pressure by preventing market professionals from entering stop and stop limit orders during a market sell-off as well as enhance market coordination of the circuit breaker rules. In turn, the Phlx believes that the proposal should help reduce market volatility. In addition, proposed Phlx Rule 134 should prevent the migration to stop orders from the primary markets to the Phlx in the case of extraordinary

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19B-4.

³ See letter from Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, to Michael Walinskas, Deputy Associate Director, Division of Market Regulation ("Division"), Commission, dated December 8, 1998 ("Amendment No. 1"); letter from Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, to Michael Walinskas, Deputy Associate Director, Division, Commission, dated February 1, 1999 ("Amendment No. 2"); and letter from Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, to Michael Walinskas, Associate Director, Division, Commission, dated July 13, 1999 ("Amendment No. 3").

⁴ Securities Exchange Act Release No. 41789 (August 25, 1999), 64 FR 47885.

⁵ See Letter from Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, to David Sieradzki, Special Counsel, Commission, dated July 14, 2000 ("Amendment No. 4"). The Commission has approved a proposed rule change (SR-NYSE-98-45) to eliminate the stop and stop limit order ban under Rule 80A. See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 41041 (Feb. 11, 1999), 64 FR 8424 (Feb. 19, 1999). As a result, in amendment No. 4, the Exchange eliminates references to stop and stop limit order bans occurring pursuant to NYSE Rule 80A.

⁶ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 39846 (April 9, 1998), 63 FR 18477 (April 15, 1998) (Order approving SR-PHLX-98-15).

⁷ See Boston Stock Exchange Rules Chapter II, Section 35(b); and Chicago Stock Exchange Chapter IX, Rule 10B, .01(ii).

⁸ See Amendment No. 2, *supra* note 3. The Commission notes that, pursuant to Boston Stock Exchange Rules Chapter II, Section 35 (b), any stop or stop limit orders residing on the specialist's book when a ban goes into effect for an individual stock will be canceled by the Exchange.

⁹ See Amendment No. 3, *supra* note 3. In Amendment No. 3, the Exchange amended Rule 134(c)(iii) to codify factors to be considered in determining whether stop and stop limit orders on the book would be cancelled in the event that the Exchange institutes a stop order ban in an individual stock. These factors include: (1) If the primary market cancels stop orders residing on their book; on (2) other unusual conditions or circumstances. See Amendment No. 3, *supra*, note 3.

¹⁰ PACE is an electronic order entry, delivery, and execution system which operates on the equity floor pursuant to Phlx Rule 229.

¹¹ See Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 3.

¹² Telephone conversation between Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, and David Sieradzki, Special Counsel, Division, Commission, on July 21, 1999.